The Builder.

No. CLX.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1845.

IN our journal of the 12th ult. (p. 169, *ante*) we communicated two awards by the official referees, as to bows and projections to houses commenced before last January, establishing conclusively what we had before urged, that projections which were part of the original design, *although not yet formed*, were "already built" in the eyes of the law, and did not fall within the provisions of the Buildings Act,—always provided that the same should be finished and the houses rendered fit for use before January, 1846.

At the close of the article we remarked, "we need say no more on this subject." The law seemed so clear to common sense, and the referees had so strongly enforced it by these awards, that we thought it was not likely that the question would be again raised. We were, however, wrong in that belief, and are induced to state the particulars of one other case in point, with the referees' decision, as a warning to the obstinate and litigious.

In the autumn of last year, Mr. Harvey, a builder, erected a detached house on Lord Dartmouth's land in the Lewisham-road, with a porch in front and bow window at back. The carcase was covered in, and the basement story of both porch and bow erected by December. The upper part of the bow was to be formed in timber (so shewn on the plans originally made); and when the builder last month completed it, as always intended, Mr. Badger, the district surveyor, gave him notice of irregularity, and ultimately he was summoned to appear before the referees at the "Lion and Lamb," Lewisham,— not an inapposite conjunction.

The facts above stated were proved and admitted; and it was shewn at the hearing that the registrar, on receipt of the district surveyor's information against the builder in question, had actually directed his attention to the awards we have alluded to, so that he was unable to plead ignorance in excuse. Lord Dartmouth's surveyor, Mr. Godwin, who attended for the builder, called on the referees (in the full assurance that they could do no other than award against the interference of the district surveyor) to provide for the payment of his client's personal costs, urging justly, that when the builder is wrong they force him to pay an extra fee to the district surveyor for his attendance, and therefore when he is right they ought not to allow the expense of professional assistance to fall on him.

The award of the referees, which has just been taken up, does not go quite so far as this, but determines that the bow does not fall within the provisions of the said Act, and that all the costs and expenses, so far as relate to the Office of Metropolitan Buildings, are to be paid by Mr. Badger.

We may hope that this award will have a salutary effect; it will be aided by a second, made by the referees, on a case heard at Lewisham on the same day as the preceding. This relates to repairing the chimney shafts of some houses at Hither Green. The owner had requested a builder to stop a leakage in one of the roofs, and make good the pointing. Upon examination, it was thought necessary to point the chimney shafts; and, according to the builder's statement, about a dozen bricks were replaced by new. The whole repair did not amount to 3*l*. The district surveyor seeing what had been done, remonstrated with the builder for not giving him notice, and, as a correspondent informs us, declared he would, in consequence, compel him to raise the chimney shafts, as they were not of the height required by schedule F; that is, not less than three feet above the highest part of the roof, flat, or gutter adjoining thereto.

The award of the referees, and it is one of considerable importance, is as follows:—

"That inasmuch as the repair in question was not a repair involving *a structural alteration*, the same was not liable to be raised to the height of three feet, according to the rule in schedule F of the said Act;

"And with regard to the costs and expenses attending this proceeding, they do further award that the same be *paid by the said Charles Robert Badger*; that is to say, as to the fees and expenses of the Office of Metropolitan Buildings, that on or before the 17th of May, inst., the sum of 2*l*. 6*s*. be paid to the Registrar of Metropolitan Buildings, at the said office, at No. 3, Trafalgar Square, London."

One word to the district surveyor on whom these expenses have fallen, and we say it from a sense of duty, prompted by no less than five statements now before us, and without any ill-nature, or desire to annoy. He is placed in his office to see an Act of Parliament carried out for the protection of the public, not to bring that Act into discsteem, and to induce evasion of it by uncalled for interference, or even by stringently enforcing the letter, rather than attending to its spirit; and we sincerely hope that he will take a fresh view of his position, and do nothing needlessly to render the office of district surveyor unpopular.

OUTSIDE WINDOW BLINDS.—Some of the district surveyors having considered that outside window blinds must be regarded as projections from face walls within the meaning of the Buildings Act, summoned the makers to remove their work. A meeting of master window-blind makers was in consequence held, and they, finding great want of information as to whether they could proceed in finishing the various orders they had received, addressed a requisition to the referees setting forth this fact, and asking an award or certificate to enable them to follow their business without interruption or delay. They forwarded diagrams of the ordinary window blinds (known as Oriental, Florentine, Spanish, Hood-blind, Venetian-shade, and Shutter-blind), and the referees have certified that such window blinds "are *not* projections from face walls within the meaning of the Metropolitan Buildings Act, and do *not* come within the operation of the said Act."

PORTLAND TOWN CHURCH.—It has been proposed to erect a church to contain 1000 sittings in Portland Town, a district of the metropolis containing a population of at least 5,000, of whom the greater part are very poor. The cost of the site will be 1,700*l*., and the building is estimated at 6,500*l*., making a total of 8,200*l*. Towards defraying this amount Her Majesty's Commissioners have granted 500*l*., the Metropolis Churches Fund 1,500*l*., and subscriptions have been promised amounting to 2,440*l*., making up altogether the sum of 4,440*l*. For supplying the deficiency of 3,760*l*. an appeal to the public has been made, and a subscription opened.

ON THE WALLS OF ANCIENT AND MODERN ROME.

BY THE REV. RICHARD BURGESS, B.D.*

WHEN I had the honour of attempting to describe and illustrate the aqueducts of ancient Rome, I remarked that there was some association between those great works and the walls of the city. The first period of the ruin of Rome was marked by the partial destruction of the walls and aqueducts; the materials of the one served for constructing a fortress, while the other were falling before the destructive engines of the Goths; and the breaches were subsequently repaired under the care of Belisarius with the large peperine blocks of the Claudian arches. I also announced my intention of making the walls a separate subject, beginning with those of Romulus and Remus, which perhaps never existed, and ending with the Aurelian circuit, which existed too much for the theory of antiquaries. I thought it a desirable subject to learn how walls were made when arrows were instruments of war, without meaning, however, to illustrate that point by shooting with a long bow. I shall confine myself as nearly as possible within the limits of historical truth, and I hope I shall not violate too much your rules of architectural proportion.

Although walled or fenced cities reaching up to heaven are now of little use in modern tactics, they were of great importance in the time of ancient warfare. The huge masses of stone piled one upon another were a sufficient defence against the rude engines of attack, when brute force without skill aimed its blow upon the immoveable barrier. In very remote times, carrying us back to the days of Homer, at least, walls of cities were reared of huge polyhedric stones, uncut and unshaped, with the interstices filled up with small stones or broken pieces of flint, and this has received the name of Cyclopean. It is not properly Cyclopean construction, if there be any attempt at cutting or squaring the blocks. I have observed a specimen of this construction in the island of Cephalonia, where, in the walls of Cranii, I measured an irregular block of stone to be 13 feet 10 inches in length, and 6 feet 10 in depth. Another specimen is to be seen in the walls of Tyrins, at the extremity of the plain of Argos, where the huge stones are laid one upon another without any attempt at cutting out the angles. The walls of Mycenæ, although containing similar specimens, are upon the whole an improvement: the interstices are sometimes removed by a slight linear adjustment of the blocks, and such a step in masonry destroys in part the character of Cyclopean. The next step was angularity, and then came the construction which is properly speaking Hellenic, and this had prevailed in Etruria long before Romulus began to enclose the Palatine Hill at Rome. I cannot enter into a disquisition on the walls of antiquity generally, but if any of you are curious upon this subject you will do well to consult the atlas which belongs to Micali's work, entitled "L'Italia avanti il dominio dei Romani," published at Florence in 1821. Sir William Gell has also illustrated this subject with his usual accuracy and skill.

The most ancient buildings of Rome of which vestiges now remain, were of stone brought from Alba, commonly called peperine. This was used under the kings, as we see in the Cloaca Maxima, and in the Mamertine prison built by Ancus Martius. It was of the same material that Servius Tullius built his walls, and Tarquin fortified his agger. We find it in the tomb of the Scipio, in the Temple of Piety, in the substructions of the Capitol, and in the aqueducts of the republic. But as this stone was not accessible to the Romans before the conquest of Alba under Tullus Hostilius, we cannot admit Romulus into the primitive society of *free masons*. If we may still adhere to the old story of that hero having surrounded the Palatine Hill with a wall, and made three gates to his new city, we can afford him very little material better than baked mud and pumice stone; and the innocent freak of poor Remus leaping over his brother's fortifications has thrown immortal contempt upon the walls of the founder of Rome. This may be altogether a subject too remote and too insignificant to claim your attention, but the descrip-

* The substance of this paper was read at the Institute of British Architects on the 19th inst.

To learn more about OCR and PDF Compression go to our website